APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,290	10/22/2003	Scott Douglas Frei	ROC920030290US1	2244

7590   06/12/2008

Grant A. Johnson
IBM Corporation
Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 February 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-11,13 and 14</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-11,13 and 14</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A.   This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed:

2/28/2008. This action is made **Final**.

B.   Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13 and 14 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering

patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the

subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions

covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised

of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of

each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35

U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

obvious over George Francis DeStefano (US 6,075,531), herein referred to as

"DeStefano" in view of Bhogal et al (US 6,806,888), herein referred to as "Bhogal".

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.
Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art
only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome
by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in
the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an
invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject
matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed
in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR
1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and
reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the
application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer
in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing
that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under
35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As for independent claims 1 and 9, DeStefano teaches a method and corresponding
apparatus comprising: presenting a plurality of windows on an output device (figure 10,
col.5, lines 7-19; wherein the user on a computer system is running an application and
is connected in a distributed computing environment wherein the application being ran
can be ran on another machine thru means of a server or direct connection within the
distributed computing environment); wherein each of the plurality of windows displays a
respective application and a respective group identifier that indicates a respective group

to which the respective application in the respective window belongs, wherein at least

one of the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be

sent to an auxiliary output device (figure 11; col.13, lines 10-67 and col.14, lines 1-6;

wherein the user groups application windows together and the grouping is indicated with

an icon of currently selected windows in a group, from there the user can manipulate

the group in such as moving it to another screen connected to the computer and since

the computer system is connected in a distribution computing environment that other

device can be a another computer system which has a projector as a display (col.5,

lines 20-29) when of course doing so that user can pick and choose what windows to

manipulate which in a sense is denying specific content form the users computer

system to be displayed on another computer system whom which has a projector as a

computer display which has a graphical indicator of selected windows being

manipulated); detecting a bringing into focus of a first window, wherein the brining into

focus of the first window comprises the first window is ready to accept input (col.8, lines

27-31; window(s) are detected by bringing them into focus for selection to be

manipulated (moved)); in response to the detecting the bringing into focus of the first

window, determining whether a first record associated with the first window exists in a

group data structure comprising a plurality of records, wherein the respective record is

associated with the respective group (figure 4,6 and 11; col.8, lines 27-31 a group of

windows are affected simultaneously, the windows are apart of a group and are

manipulated as a group); wherein the auxiliary output device is separate from the

output device (figure 14; wherein the user can select a group of windows and display

them on a connected computer system in a distributed computing environment).
However to further support the DeStefano, since DeStefano does not expressly teach
taking content from one display and displaying it to another display Bhogal, in the same
field of endeavor, teaches selecting a portion of a first display and displaying it to a
second display, in such that the first display is viewed by the presenter and the second
display is viewed by the audience, thus Bhogal teaches wherein at least one of the
respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an
auxiliary output device (figures 2-3; col.2, lines 45-55; col.4, lines 8-41). Bhogal further
teaches that *if the first record associated with the first window does not exist in the
group data structure, displaying the first window on the output device and refraining
from sending the first window to the auxiliary output device; if the first record associated
with the first window does exist in the group data structure, deciding whether the first
record indicates that a first group is to be kept hidden if the first record indicates that
the first group is to be kept hidden, displaying the first window on the output device and
refraining from sending the first window to the auxiliary output device; and if the first
record indicates that the first group is not to be kept hidden, sending all of the windows
that belong to the first group to both the output device and the auxiliary output device*
(col.2, lines 54-55; col.3, lines 63-67; col.4, lines 1-11, 18-21 and 32-44; selected
portions or groups of windows or window is selected for display to auxiliary device while
content which is not selected is hidden from auxiliary device, the converter makes the
determination of which content is hidden and the splitter drives both the monitor and
converter). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine Bhogal into DeStefano because both Bhogal and DeStefano,

this is true because Bhogal provides a solution for problems in display screen

management for a plurality of windows/ content presented on a display screen (col.1,

lines 11-16).

As for dependent claims 2 and 10, DeStefano teaches the method and corresponding

apparatus of claims 1 and 9, wherein the auxiliary output device comprises a projector

(col.5, line 24).

As for dependent claims 3 and 11, DeStefano teaches plurality of records

comprises the respective group identifier, an indication of the respective applications

that belong to the respective group, an indication of whether the respective applications

that belong to the respective group are not to be sent to the auxiliary output device, and

an indication of whether data from the respective applications that belong to the

respective group is currently being sent to the auxiliary output device (col.8,lines 2-5;

use of multiple indications (icons to represent different modes of operation). DeStefano

does not specifically teach sending items to an auxiliary output device (note the analysis

of claim 1 above). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine Bhogal into DeStefano because both Bhogal and

DeStefano, this is true because Bhogal provides a solution for problems in display

screen management for a plurality of windows/ content presented on a display screen

(col.1, lines 11-16).

As for dependent claim 4, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the user

interface further comprises a taskbar, wherein the taskbar comprises a plurality of icons

for the bringing into focus of the respective applications, wherein each of the plurality of

icons comprises the respective group identifier (col.5, lines 1-19 and 40-43; the

inclusion of a taskbar as part of a operating system is apparent for a window operating

system environment; figure 11, wherein the use selects what application windows to

group together, acts as an author of what gets grouped and what does not get grouped

to be further displayed elsewhere on the display or another; note the analysis of claim 1

above; (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taskbar)).

As for dependent claim 5, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising:

if the respective group identifier is selected via an input device, sending the

windows that belong to the group, identified by the respective group identifier that was

selected to the auxiliary output device (col.8, lines 2-5; use of multiple indications (icons

to represent different modes of operation). DeStefano does not specifically teach

sending items to an auxiliary output device (note the analysis of claim 1 above). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine Bhogal into DeStefano because both Bhogal and DeStefano, this is true

because Bhogal provides a solution for problems in display screen management for a

plurality of windows/ content presented on a display screen (col.1, lines 11-16).

As for dependent claims 6 and 13, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 4, further

comprising for the windows that are sent to the auxiliary output device, updating the

indication of whether data from the respective applications that belong to the respective

group is currently being sent to the auxiliary output device to indicate that the data from

the respective applications that belong to the respective group is currently being sent to

the auxiliary output device. (figures 18-19; col.8, lines 2-5; use of multiple indications

(icons to represent different modes of operation). DeStefano does not specifically teach

sending items to an auxiliary output device (note the analysis of claim 1 above). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine Bhogal into DeStefano because both Bhogal and DeStefano, this is true

because Bhogal provides a solution for problems in display screen management for a

plurality of windows/ content presented on a display screen (col.1, lines 11-16).).

As for dependent claims 7 and 14, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 6, further

comprising: changing the respective applications that belong to the respective group in

the first record (col.9, lines 66-67; col.10, lines 1-4).

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A1.   Applicant argues the new limitation.

R1.   Examiner does not agree, please note the new claim analysis presented above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
June 5, 2008

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179